

percent when compared to last year's bill. As it is, this is incredible growth in discretionary spending; however, to truly emphasize the enormity of this increase, my colleagues should consider that this growth in spending is roughly 10 times the current rate of inflation.

The bill hides this massive increase in discretionary spending by using a variety of gimmicks. First, it proposes to offset the new spending by making cuts in crucial mandatory programs, such as the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG), the State Children's Health Insurance Program (S-CHIP) and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). After a number of colleagues and I expressed our concern over using these programs as spending offsets, Appropriations Committee Chairman STEVENS pledged his support to vitiate these cuts when the Labor-HHS bill is considered in Conference. While I commend Chairman STEVENS for his commitment to restoring these funds, it is my belief that the Appropriations Committee never should have tapped into these programs in the first place. It is my hope that the Conferees will, as they remove these offsets, look to decrease the overall level of discretionary spending in the bill rather than search for other sources.

Second, the bill moves up by 3 days the first Supplemental Security Income (SSI) payment date of Fiscal Year 2001 so that it falls, instead, in Fiscal Year 2000. Although such a change sounds innocuous, the ramifications of this action are tremendous.

As my colleagues know, the start of the next fiscal year begins on October 1, 2000. By moving the first SSI payment date of the year a few days earlier, it will fall in the waning days of fiscal year 2000 and be paid for out of the fiscal year 2000 on-budget surplus. The end result of this gimmick is that not only does it increase spending in FY 2000 by \$2.4 billion, which is, by the way, money I would rather see go to debt reduction. But it also frees up another \$2.4 billion in Fiscal Year 2001 for Congress to spend.

Finally, despite the fact that the bill increases discretionary spending by a whopping 20 percent, it still fails to prioritize and target resources towards those programs that are the responsibility of the federal government, such as fully funding our commitment under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The high cost of educating disabled students continues to place a heavy burden on our local school districts. If the federal government met its obligation to fund IDEA at the level it promised in 1975, local communities would have resources left over to fund their own education priorities.

Instead, this appropriations bill, while increasing funding for IDEA by \$1.31 billion over last year's bill and by \$984 million above President Clinton's request, does not make enough progress on IDEA. Before the federal government increases spending on new programs, it should be fully funding its

promise to supply up to 40 percent of the cost of educating disabled children.

Mr. President, what Congress has done in this Labor-HHS bill proves that we must face facts: Congress is addicted to spending. We will use any gimmick, any trick, any scheme we can think of to spend money. Often, it is for things that we don't need, things that are not a federal responsibility or things that we cannot afford.

Instead of using cuts in mandatory programs and accounting shifts to pay for massive increases in discretionary programs, we need to prioritize our spending and make the hard choices when necessary. We have used budgetary shenanigans far too often to obfuscate the size of spending increases, and it is long past time for this practice to end.

It is for these reasons, Mr. President, that I felt compelled to vote against the Labor-HHS Appropriations bill, and I do not believe that I am alone in my concerns regarding this legislation. It is my sincere hope that when the conferees meet to put together the final version of this legislation, they will consider and address the items that I have mentioned.

Mr. President, I also would like to take this opportunity to voice my concern over the conference report to H.R. 4425, the Military Construction Appropriations bill, which the Senate approved on June 30 by a voice vote. If it had been the subject of a roll call vote, I would have voted against final passage of this bill.

My concern with this legislation does not rest with the Military Construction portion of the conference report. Indeed, I voted for the bill when it originally came before the Senate in May. Rather, my concern lies with what was added to the bill since the time the Senate first passed it.

While in conference, the Military Construction Appropriations bill became the vehicle to which Fiscal Year 2000 emergency supplemental appropriations were attached. In times of true emergency, Mr. President, I believe that Congress has an obligation to ensure that supplemental funds are provided to cover unexpected expenses. That is why I have no objection to providing emergency funds for our operations in Kosovo and to those unfortunate Americans who have been the victims of natural disasters.

However, I do not believe that we should provide emergency funding for items that are not true emergencies in an effort to avoid budget rules. Unfortunately, that is precisely what H.R. 4425 does. This bill provides taxpayer dollars for such "emergencies" as the winter Olympic Games, a sea life center in Alaska and a new top-of-the-line Gulfstream jet aircraft for the Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard.

In recent years, we have seen remarkable growth in the use of emergency designations as a way to bypass the spending caps so that Congress can avoid making tough choices. Fiscal year 2000 is certainly no exception. In fact, we will be setting a new record for

"emergency" spending in this fiscal year with a final tally of more than \$40 billion.

I should also add, Mr. President, that H.R. 4425 speeds up government pay-days and uses other accounting shifts to move nearly \$12 billion of fiscal year 2001 spending into fiscal year 2000. Just as with the Labor-HHS Appropriations Bill, the conference committee used this gimmick in order to free up an additional \$12 billion for Congress to spend in Fiscal Year 2001.

Mr. President, rather than devising new, more ingenious ways to avoid fiscal discipline, we should be endeavoring to restore honesty and integrity to the congressional budget process. As I have stated on previous occasions, if any American was to cook his or her books the way the federal government does, that individual no doubt would be sent to jail very quickly. We cannot continue to apply a double standard. We must live within our means, delineate responsibility between the state and local governments and the federal government and pay for those items accordingly, and for Heaven's sake, if we have any on-budget surplus funds, use those funds to pay down the National Debt.

I will continue to monitor the progress of the remaining appropriations bills, and I encourage my colleagues to work with me to make sure that we spend federal tax dollars wisely.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

#### VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT OF 2000

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, in 1994 we passed the original Violence Against Women Act, creating programs that addressed the many forms of domestic violence all-too prevalent in the United States today. The bill helped communities create shelters, build partnerships among law enforcement agencies to respond to violence against women, and provide legal assistance to battered women. The bill also established a domestic violence hotline that receives hundreds of calls daily from people concerned about violence in their families. Now, we have the opportunity and responsibility to reauthorize this legislation to give women and children a way out of violent and unhealthy situations.

For groups that strive to combat domestic violence, the original Violence Against Women Act was a turning point in their battle. In my state, the West Virginia Coalition Against Domestic Violence stands as an outstanding example of the great work that groups devoted to the noble cause of stamping out domestic violence can do when Congress acts appropriately. With the added funding provided by the Violence Against Women Act, the Coalition was able to quadruple its staff, increase the budgets of its shelters to

meet their day-to-day needs, and increase services to under-served parts of the population of West Virginia. Many of the women who escape from violent homes cannot afford legal services, but thanks to grants authorized under the Violence Against Women Act, thirteen civil legal assistance programs are now in place around West Virginia providing free representation for women.

The Coalition also computerized its entire network, enabling instant communication with offices in other parts of rural West Virginia. By creating a database that compiles information on offenders from all over the state, they were able to work with regional jails, sheriffs, and other law enforcement agencies to use this valuable resource. I am proud to say that several other states have used West Virginia's system as a model, helping to combat domestic violence within their borders.

Passing the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 not only sustains existing programs, but creates several new initiatives that extend help to different groups and communities. The bill establishes a new formula for calculating some of the grants, enabling small states like West Virginia to continue to expand their services. In addition, it augments current policies with protections for older and disabled women, and builds on legal assistance programs to further expand coverage.

Perhaps most importantly, the passage of this legislation conveys the important message that the federal government considers domestic violence to be a serious issue. Those of us in Congress share in this concern with the people we serve. We can take some pride that by acting to address these problems, we may have moved some State governments to improve their services to abused spouses and children, and to increase the penalties meted out to the abusers.

By paying attention to this enormously important issue, and by enhancing the current legislation, we are taking steps in the right direction. Although the measures in the original legislation have helped to alleviate the problem, we must continue to wage a persistent fight as long as anyone feels unsafe in their homes.

#### FY 2000 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, on the Friday before the July 4 recess, the Senate passed the military construction appropriations bill, which included the supplemental spending package, by voice vote. Although there were a number of meritorious items in that bill, if there had been an up or down vote, I would have voted against it for a number of reasons.

I was extremely disappointed in the Conferees' decision to drop the \$5 million in emergency methamphetamine cleanup funds from the supplemental package.

There was strong support for this provision from both Democrats and Re-

publicans. And it was included in both the House and Senate supplemental packages.

So, it doesn't make sense why it was suddenly dropped—especially when we're talking about dangerous chemical sites that are left exposed in our local communities. Without this provision, the bill provides hundreds of millions to help a foreign country fight a drug war, but turns a blind eye to one of the biggest drug problems right in our own back yards. That is unacceptable.

Our failure to fund the cleanup of these labs is all the more disappointing because this bill is bloated with pork. There is \$700 million here for the Coast Guard alone, including \$45 million for a C-37A aircraft for the Coast Guard. The C-37 is a Gulfstream V executive jet. It's not even your average corporate jet, but one of the most expensive, top-of-the-line crafts.

Why should the American taxpayers pay \$45 million so the Coast Guard officers can fly in luxury, when the military has trouble keeping its planes aloft because they lack spare parts? There is a drug crisis in this country and an immediate need for funds for peacekeeping operations, but that's no reason to buy luxury jets in an emergency spending bill.

Mr. President, without the meth funding, states and local communities will have to bear the burden of cleaning up these highly toxic sites that are found every day in Iowa and throughout the Midwest, West and Southwest.

In recent years, the Drug Enforcement Agency has provided critical financial assistance to help clean up these dangerous sites, which can cost thousands of dollars each.

Unfortunately, in March, the DEA ran out of funds to provide methamphetamine lab cleanup assistance to state and local law enforcement. That's because last year, this funding was cut in half while the number of meth labs found and confiscated has been growing.

In late May, the Administration shifted \$5 million in funds from other Department of Justice Accounts to pay for emergency meth lab cleanup. And I believe that will help reimburse these states for the costs they have incurred since the DEA ran out of money. My state of Iowa has already paid some \$300,000 of its own pocket for cleanup since March.

However, we've got months to go before the new fiscal year—and the number of meth labs being found and confiscated are still on the rise. My \$5 million provision in this emergency spending package would have provided enough money to pay for costly meth lab cleanup without forcing states to take money out of their other tight law enforcement budgets.

If we can find the money to fight drugs in Colombia, we should be able to find the money to fight drugs in our own backyard. We should not risk exposing these dangerous meth sites to our communities.

So I urge the Senate to support adding the \$5 million in emergency meth cleanup funds to the FY 2001 Foreign Operations spending bill or another appropriations vehicle. It is unfair to force our state and local communities to shoulder this financial burden alone.

#### NOMINATION OF MADELYN CREEDON

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I wish to add my voice to that of my colleagues on behalf of Madelyn Creedon's nomination. She has been selected by the President to become the first Deputy Administrator for defense programs in the new National Nuclear Security Administration, NNSA, at the Department of Energy. I had the privilege of working closely with Madelyn while she served on the minority staff for the Strategic Forces Subcommittee. I have great respect for her ability and judgment, and I'm confident she will do an excellent job for General Gordon and the country. In addition to being skillful and reliable, Madelyn's knowledge of DOE issues is absolutely unsurpassed. Besides her work on the Senate Armed Services Committee, she was the Associate Deputy Secretary of Energy for National Security Programs at DOE, General Counsel for the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, majority Counsel for the Senate Armed Services Committee under the Chairmanship of Senator Sam Nunn, and finally, trial attorney and Acting Assistant General Counsel with the DOE. Her entire career has prepared her for this important assignment, and it should be no surprise that the President asked her to help lay the foundation for the success of the NNSA. As a member of the Senate, you rarely get the opportunity to vote on the nomination of someone you have observed as closely as I have observed Madelyn. Having done so, I lend her my unqualified support. Mr. President, I have but to note the vote of support by the members of the Armed Services Committee. The high esteem that I hold Madelyn is reflected throughout. This Chamber will be proud of its vote today, and we will be lucky to have Madelyn serve her country in this capacity. I congratulate Madelyn and her family. I will miss having her guidance and work ethic on the Strategic Subcommittee. However, our loss is truly the country's gain.

#### THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Monday, July 10, 2000, the Federal debt stood at \$5,662,949,608,628.38 (Five trillion, six hundred sixty-two billion, nine hundred forty-nine million, six hundred eighty thousand, six hundred twenty-eight dollars and thirty-eight cents).

Five years ago, July 10, 1995, the Federal debt stood at \$4,924,015,000,000 (Four trillion, nine hundred twenty-four billion, fifteen million).